Application No. 09/893,736
Amendment dated April 9, 2004
Response to Office Action of October 23, 2003

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P11033
Examiner: Taghi T. Arani
TC/A.U. 2131

REMARKS

Status of the claims:

Claims 1-16, 19-23, and 25-28 remain for reconsideration. Claims 17-18, 24, and 29-30 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Dependent claims 31-34 have been newly added, all directed to the subject matter of claim 18 found allowable by the Examiner.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication in the Office Action that the subject matter of claim 18 is allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, features of claims 17 and 18 have been incorporated into parent claim 6. Claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-16 and 19-22 should now be in condition for allowance.

In addition, newly added claims 31-34 have been added to depend from independent claims 1, 23, 25, and 27, respectively, and all include features found allowable in claim 18. Accordingly, claims 31-34 should also be found allowable.

Prior Art Rejections:

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-17 and 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

as being anticipated by D. Harkins et al., "The Internet Key Exchange (IKE)"

Request for Comments (2409), November 1998.

Similarly, claims 2, 8, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Harkins in view of D. Dukes et al.,

"ISAKMP Configuration Model", The Internet- Draft, March 2000, further in

view of Y. Dylan et al., "IKE Base Mode", Internet-Draft, January 2000.

Harkins, Dukes, and Dylan were all cited in the International Search

Report in a corresponding PCT application.

These rejections are respectfully traversed based on the following

discussion.

Embodiments of the present invention offer a way to dynamically

configure a secure tunnel between a client (first peer) and a remote Gateway

(second peer) over a network, such as the Internet. During a Phase 1

negotiation, the first peer offers a plurality of security configuration proposals

(see paragraph [0037], for example of the specification). The second peer may

then select one of these security configuration proposals and send its choice

back to the first peer.

Allowable claim 18 recited the feature directed to a plurality of

security configuration proposals being put in order by the first peer from most

secure to least secure. In this manner the second peer may first consider, and

thus more likely choose, the most secure configuration possible that can be

supported by both peers.

However, in reviewing the prior art to Harkins, Dukes, and Dylan none

of these references appear to teach or suggest the first peer offering a plurality

of security configuration proposals to the second peer to choose from,

regardless of order.

Thus, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "…initiating, by

a first peer, a negotiation with a second peer, the negotiation including a

plurality of security configuration proposals;

sending, by the second peer, information to the first peer;

extracting, by the first peer, a security configuration selected from among the

plurality of security configuration proposals from the information sent by the

second peer…" (emphasis added).

Similarly, independent claims 23 now recites "…sending, by a second

peer, information to a first peer that initiated a negotiation with the second

peer, the information including a security configuration selected from among a

plurality of security configuration proposals offered by the first peer…"

12

(emphasis added).

Likewise, independent claim 25 now recites "…the first peer is

configured to initiate a negotiation with the second peer, wherein the

negotiation includes a plurality of security configuration proposals;

the second peer is configured to send information to the first peer,

the first peer is configured to extract a security configuration selected from

among the plurality of security configuration proposals from the information

sent by the second peer…" (emphasis added).

Finally, independent claim 27 now recites "…initiating, by a first peer,

a negotiation with a second peer, the negotiation including a plurality of

security configuration proposals;

extracting, by the first peer, a security configuration selected from

among the plurality of security configuration proposals from information sent

by the second peer…" (emphasis added).

The above features are not taught or suggested by the prior art of

record. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejections based on the prior

art of record be withdrawn and these claims be reconsidered in their amended

form.

Application No. 09/893,736
Amendment dated April 9, 2004
Response to Office Action of October 23, 2003

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P11033
Examiner: Taghi T. Arani
TC/A.U. 2131

In view of the foregoing, it requested that the application be

reconsidered, that claims 1-16, 19-23, and 25-28, and 3-34 be allowed and that

the application be passed to issue. Please charge any shortages and credit any

overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: APRIL 9 2004

Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200

14